UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,512	08/29/2001	David Perez Corral	FR920010024US1	9605

7590 12/02/2005

James Boice Esq
Dillon & Yudall LLP
8911 North Capital Of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759

EXAMINER
STEELMAN, MARY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 September 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-15,17 and 18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1,3-15,17 and 18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to Appeal Brief filed 1 September 2005. The prior

Final Office Action is hereby withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-15, 17 and 18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 4-10, 13-15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent 5,799,286 to Morgan et al., in view of US Patent 6,088,717 to Reed

et al., and further in view of US Patent 6,519,763 B1 to Kaufer et al.

Per claim 1:

A computer implemented method for operating a quality plan in a product development

organization comprising a plurality of members and having quality objectives for product

development projects, the method comprising the steps of:

(Morgan: Col. 1, lines 66-67, "...an automated activity-based management system (product

development organization) and method...", col. 2, lines 1-2, "The business organization has

costs associated with its people (plurality of members)...", col. 4, lines 5-11, "The automated

activity based management system also includes an on-line reporting feature, which may

generate predefined or user-defined reports on a periodic basis or on demand. Examples of the

many types of reports available may include trend, forecast, benchmark, site comparison,

standard service, activity output, matrix, quality (quality plan), and value-added reports (quality

objectives)."

-defining a set quality processes adapted to quality objectives required by an organization,

wherein the set of quality processes includes:

(Morgan: Col. 17, lines 26-31, "The automated activity-based management system may generate

a number of different reports summarizing information for many business purposes. Examples

of the types or reports available are:...quality...", col. 18, lines 44-63, "Quality

Benchmark...Site Trend Quality Reports...Site Comparison Quality Reports...Consolidated

Trend Quality Reports..." Quality processes are defined in the quality reports.)

-a tracking process for identifying an issue in the product development projects...

Morgan disclosed, (Col. 4, lines 40-43), "Constructed in this manner, the activity-based

management system is a flexible tool that not only tracks (tracking process) current operational

performance (tracking process), but also provides the information for forecasts or budgets

(identifying an issue).", col. 6, lines 43-47, "...the user enters the target or goal cost per unit of

each product (product development projects). This input may be used to gauge the performance

of the management organization.", col. 7, lines 35-36, "...employees may use a time tracking

software program (tracking process for identifying an issue)...")

-... the tracking process being an internal project management tracking process that reports a status of current risks according to a priority of a risk issue and a target date for resolution of the risk issue:

Morgan disclosed, col. 4, lines 5-11, "The automated activity-based management system also includes an on-line reporting feature, which may generate predefined or user-defined reports (reports a status of current risks) on a periodic basis or on demand. Examples of the many types of reports available may include trend, forecast (target dates), benchmark (priority of a risk issue & target date for resolution), site comparison, standard service, activity output, matrix, quality (current risks), and value-added reports. Morgan may not have used the exact words of the claimed limitations, such as 'priority of a risk issue', 'target date of resolution', etc. , but Morgan disclosed predefined or user-defined reports may be generated. Inherently examples (col. 4, lines 9-11) given by Morgan include such reports as status / priority of risks and target dates for resolution. These are features typically of concern in a quality plan of a product development organization and consideration of these features ensure (col. 1, lines 39-42) a true gauge of the business operations, and enable better strategic business and management decisions.

-...reporting for providing communications among members of the organization...

Morgan disclosed, (Col. 5, lines 4-6), "The reports are customized (daily / consolidated to weekly reports) to provide different levels of granularity of details to cater to the needs of different levels of personnel (members of the organization)",

-a documentation process for reviewing and accepting documents generated by the product

development projects;

Morgan disclosed (Col. 4, lines 5-11), "The automated activity-based management system also

includes an on-line reporting feature, which may generate predefined or use-defined reports

(reviewing and accepting documents) on a periodic basis or on demand. Examples of the many

types of reports available may include trend, forecast, benchmark, site comparison, standard

service, activity output, matrix, quality, and value-added reports.")

-an inspection process for determining deliverables generated by the product development

projects to be reworked;

Morgan disclosed (Col. 18, lines 43-63), "Quality Benchmark...Site Trend Quality Reports-

Details a site's costs by quality attribute for any number of months. Users can track the results

of quality initiatives that have been implemented. Users can view the individual activities/costs

that contribute to a selected quality attribute in order to pinpoint opportunities for quality

improvements (inspect / determine rework)..." Morgan disclosed (Col. 4, lines 5-11), "The

automated activity-based management system also includes an on-line reporting feature, which

may generate predefined or use-defined reports on a periodic basis or on demand. Examples of

the many types of reports available may include trend, forecast, benchmark, site comparison,

standard service, activity output, matrix, quality (inspection process for determining deliverables

generated by the product development projects to be reworked), and value-added reports.")

-a metrics process for producing metrics for the data relative to the product development

projects;

Morgan disclosed (Col. 8, line 5-7), "As related to production measurement (metrics)..."

Morgan considered metrics at col. 6, lines 43-47, "...the target or goal cost per unit (metrics for

the data relative to the product development projects) of each product...input may be used to

gauge the performance of the management organization..."

-defining a set of computer implemented quality tools to collect data relative product

development projects, said quality tools comprising at least one database to store said

collected data;

Morgan disclosed (col. 2, lines 19-25), "The system includes a relational database which receives

traditional accounting information and accepts information related to activities (quality tools to

collect data) provided by the users. The activity information includes the activities performed,

the percentage of time each activity is performed...", col. 4, lines 40-43, "Constructed in this

manner, the activity-based management system is a flexible tool (computer implemented quality

tools)...")

-for each quality process, aggregating a set of the stored data to generate a respective

quality report;

(Morgan: col. 3, line 47-49, "At the heard of the system is a relational database with organized

data structures containing raw business data and processed activity cost information...", col. 4,

lines 5-11, "The automated activity-based management system also includes an on-line reporting

feature (aggregating a set of the stored data to generate a respective quality report) which may

generate predefined or user-defined reports on a periodic basis or on demand. Examples of the

many types of reports available may include trend, forecast, benchmark, site comparison,

standard service, activity output, matrix, quality, and value-added reports.")

-analyzing each quality report to detect problems in the product development projects;

(Morgan: col. 4, lines 22-26, "The activity-based management view maps these same

expenditures to activities such as...problem resolution (analyzing to detect problems)...")

-using results of the analyzing step to initiate actions to resolve the problems detected, thereby

improving quality the product development projects.

(Morgan: Col. 4, line 25, "...problem resolution (using results of the analyzing step to initiate

actions to resolve the problems)...")

Regarding the limitation:

-a meeting set-up and reporting process for preparing and conducting meetings among a plurality

of members of the organization;

Morgan failed to address "meeting set-ups... for preparing and conducting meetings" in product

development processes.

However, Reed disclosed an automated communications system, involving the use of databases

(col. 12, line 1), using a "pushing" method of information transfer or a "pulling" method for data

communications (col. 12, lines 50-63). See FIG. 47 and col. 142, line 50-col. 143, line 58 for a

disclosure of scheduling a meeting, and managing discussions.

Regarding the limitation:

-... wherein the daily headlights reporting process includes a headlight report being generated by

a team leader, the headlight report including achievements of a day, changes to a project-plan;

assistance needed for a project and potential catastrophes associated with the project and wherein

a quality management office consolidates the headlight reports daily into a single executive

report and wherein issue records are created daily from the consolidated headlight reports to

initiate corrective actions to the project and wherein the executive reports are consolidated

weekly into a summary report;

Morgan disclosed, (col. 4, lines 5-11), "The automated activity-based management system also

includes an on-line reporting feature, which may generate predefined or user-defined reports on a

periodic basis or on demand. Examples of the many types of reports available may include

trend, forecast, benchmark (priority of a risk issue & target date for resolution), site comparison,

standard service, activity output, matrix, quality (initiate corrective actions), and value-added

report. Morgan failed to explicitly disclose 'daily headlights reporting", consolidating headlight

reports into a single executive report, and further consolidating weekly into a summary report.

However, Kaufer disclosed (col. 1, lines 24-26) "automated collection and processing of project

completion data relating to computer software development." Col. 1, lines 48-56, "the collected

data is stored...for evaluation of the schedule...and project status, including estimated cost,

available functionality, and quality levels...the ability to alert system users to potential

difficulties (potential catastrophes)." Col. 4, lines 47-49, a Template directory structure allows

customization regarding how the information is collected, maintained and presented. Col. 6,

lines 43-45, a Reports directory provides options for "anytime, **daily, weekly** and monthly"

reporting. (emphasis added) Col. 6, lines 55-60, "Application Server 22 reviews the analyze

index files, which directs the program to the analyze files and runs any analyze programs marked

as daily...weekly..." Col. 14, lines 44-52, "the SQM (software quality management) data

collectors comprises the following tables: a defects tables...a jobs tables...and outcomes

tables...trends table...based on all of the data collected from the SQM data collectors and the

above defined generated tables, software quality management reports are generated (consolidated

reports)." Col. 16, line 3, "project managers can take early corrective action ((potential

catastrophes) to initiate corrective actions)."

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Morgan's

invention to include scheduled meetings, as disclosed by Reed, because Morgan (Morgan: col. 1,

lines 59-61) noted the need for effective communication, "...there is a need for an automated

activity-based management system that provides continuous, dynamic, and real-time cost

information and reports" to reliably view an organization operations, and conducting meetings is

only one additional manner to disseminate information useful for quality planning. It would

have been obvious to further modify Morgan / Reed, by using Kaufer who disclosed software

quality management capabilities (col. 14, line 15), using customized reports generated daily,

weekly or periodically, to notify / alert team members of potential problems (col. 14, line 65),

prediction of project delivery (col. 17, line 54), trends (col. 18, line 18) or defects (col. 18, line

20), as this communication promotes (col. 2, lines 48-49) "allows the user to concentrate their

energy on a timely delivery of a product."

Per claim 4:

-wherein the tracking process further comprises the steps of:

-recording the identified issue within an issue storing area of the at least one database;

(Morgan: FIG. 7, col. 5, lines 58-63, "FIG. 7 provides an exemplary summary of the types of

data that are input into the automated activity-based management system database. Two broad

categories of inputs are possible, those entered by users and those entered and maintained by the

system operators.".)

-assigning to the issue priority, a resolution target date, and an organization member responsible;

(Morgan: Col. 7, lines 21-23, "Another kind of attribute, called value-added may be assigned to

activities to indicate how crucial the activities are (priorities) with respect to serving the

customer.", col. 7, lines 54-64, "A third type of information is human resources information on

employees (organization member responsible), which may include the employee name and

number, job category, and the responsibility center. In a forecasting (resolution target date) of

budget-generating scenario, the automated activity based management system preferably uses

historical activity information, in addition to estimated projections for certain equipment

utilization, activity cost information and product volumes...The system is also capable of

providing a forecast of activity information... ")

-communicating to members of the organization actions taken to resolve the issue item.

(Morgan: Col. 4, lines 5-11, "...generate predefined or user-defined reports on a periodic basis

or on demand...")

Per claim 5:

-the recorded issue comprises a field for indicating an open date, an issue identifier, a description

of the issue, and an open status.

(Morgan: Col. 7, lines 3-13, "Attributes are labels used to sore and classify data. In the

automated activity based management system attributes are used to classify activities...the

performance of these activities eliminates the opportunity for non-conformance and ensures

quality. Another set of activities may have service attributes which indicate that these activities

are related to predefined services...there are also activities that are customer-specific, and are

labeled with the appropriate attributes...")

Per claim 6:

-updating the open status field to a close status for a resolved issue in the at least one database.

(Morgan: Col. 7, line 10, "service attributes")

Per claim 7:

Morgan disclosed storing important information in databases (Morgan: FIG. 7), but

failed to address meetings. However Reed disclosed:

-the meeting set-up and reporting process further comprises the steps of:

(Reed: FIG. 47)

-creating a meeting record in a meeting storing area of the at least one database, the meeting

record comprising a meeting place, a meeting attendee, and a meeting agenda;

(Reed: Col. 142, line 50-col. 143, line 58, "…a schedule object for setting up a meeting…")

-sending an invitation the meeting attendee; and sending a meeting report after completion of the

meeting to receivers.

(Reed: Col. 142, line 50-col. 143, line 58, "…a notification element…a distribution list

component to which additional recipients can be added…)

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of

the invention, to modify Morgan's invention to include features of meeting set-ups, because it is

merely an additional well known method of group communication.

Per claim 8:

-storing the meeting report in a reports storing area of the at least one database.

(Morgan: FIG. 7.)

Per claim 9:

-the daily headlights reporting process further comprises the steps of:

-generating headlight reports having headlights data;

(Morgan: Col. 5, lines 4-6, "The reports are customized...")

-consolidating at first predetermined frequency the headlights reports a single executive report

to be distributed to an executive distribution list;

(Morgan: Col. 5, lines 4-6, "The reports are customized to provide different levels of granularity

or details to cater to the needs of different levels of personnel(executive report)...")

-recording issue items in an issue memory area based on data of the executive report;

(Morgan: FIG. 7.)

-generating at a second predetermined frequency a headlight summary based on the executive

reports.

(Morgan: Col. 19, lines 35-51, "USER-PROFILE REPORTING Matrix Report...for a selected

management organization (executive reports) for the current month... Activity Output

Report...Data Integrity Report...)

Per claim 10

-storing the executive report and the headlight summary in a reports memory area of the at least

one database.

(Morgan: FIG. 7.)

Per claim 13:

-the inspection process further comprises the steps of:

-creating an inspection record in an inspection memory area the at least one database, the

inspection record comprising an open date, an inspection record identifier, a priority, a

description of deliverable, and a target date to complete the inspection process.

(Morgan: FIG. 7, database, Col. 7, lines 25-31, "...the attributes may be used to generate reports

containing information of specific activities identified by certain attributes (creating an

inspection record with attributes).")

Per claim 14:

-the metrics process further comprises the steps of:

-analyzing a quality metrics report,

(Morgan: Col. 17, lines 46-50, "Product Benchmark – Enables a site to track the trend (metrics)

of actual product cost versus the target product cost. Via the benchmark analyses(metrics), a site

can compare the results to the lowest cost site as well as the average of all comparable sites.")

-recording the quality metrics report in a metrics memory area of the at least one database.

(Morgan: FIG. 7.)

Per claim 15:

-the metrics further comprise product metrics.

(Morgan: Col. 17, lines 26-31, "The automated activity-based management system may generate a number of different reports summarizing information for many business purposes. Examples of the types of reports available are: products...quality...service, value added...")

Per claim 17:

-the using results step further comprises the step of creating at least one quality action record in a quality actions memory area of the at least one database, the at least one quality action record comprising;

(Morgan: FIG. 7, database)

-an open date, a quality action identifier, a priority, a description of a quality action, a target date to operate the quality action.

(Morgan: Col. 18, line 48-col. 19, line 25, "Site Trend Quality Reports...quality attribute...Users can track the results of quality initiatives that have been implemented. Users can view the individual activities/costs that contribute to a selected quality attribute in order to pinpoint opportunities for quality improvements...Site Comparison Quality Reports...Consolidated Trend Quality Reports...SERVICE/PROCESS Service/Process Benchmark-Enables a site to track their trend of actual service costs. Via the benchmark analyses, a site can compare...Site Trend Service Reports...users can view the individual activities/costs that contribute to a selected standard service's cost. Site Comparison Service Reports...Consolidated Trend Service Reports...")

Per claim 18:

-determining a cause of a defect in a software being created by the product development

organization, wherein the determining step is performed by determining if one or more events

occurred, the one or more events being from a group of events that includes a miscommunication

between members of a software development team, a software transcription error, and inadequate

training of the members of the software development team.

Morgan disclosed (col.4, lines 15-28),"The automated activity-based management system of the

present invention takes this traditional accounting information, along with some additional

business information provided by the user, and allocates the monetary cost or dollars to the

activities performed. For example, the traditional general ledger view of a computer network

operation business unit maps the money spent to salaries, hardware, software, maintenance, and

space. The activity-based management view maps these same expenditures to activities such as

network surveillance, network testing, technical assistance (to provide for **inadequate training**),

problem resolution (**miscommunication** between members of a software development team, a

software transcription error, and inadequate training of the members of the software

development team), vendor interaction, and configuration changes. Activity-based management

thus provides a more realistic, operational, and meaningful view of how the money was spent."

(emphasis added) Col. 18, lines 48-53, "Site Trend Quality Reports…can track the results of

quality initiatives that have been implemented…view the individual activities/costs that

contribute to a selected quality attribute in order to pinpoint opportunities for quality

improvements (determine cause of defects)." While not using the same terms as the claimed

limitations, Morgan disclosed that "the cause of a defect" is mapped to events related to a group of events.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, the time of the invention, to modify the Morgan / Reed combination, to include the limitations of claim 18 because (Morgan: col. 1, lines 20-27), "…in today's service businesses and manufacturing environments, automation has substantially reduced the amount of direct material and labor consumption, so that indirect activities have become a significant factor contributing to the cost of making the product. The result gives business managers a skewed view of how the business organization spends money, which may cause them to make pricing errors, mis-allocate resources, and make strategic mistakes." Morgan did give consideration to the cause of a defect.

4.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,799,286 to Morgan et al., in view of US Patent 6,088,717 to Reed et al., in view of US Patent 6,519,763 B1 to Kaufer et al., and further in view of US Patent 6,073,107 to Minkiewicz et al.

Per claim 3:

Morgan suggested consideration of (Col. 4, lines 1-2) "…employee activity information…"
However, the Morgan / Reed / Kaufer combination failed to disclose specific details related to:
-further comprising survey process to evaluate a contribution of a member of the organization to a quality plan wherein the evaluation of the contribution of the member is based on a difficulty of a software project,

-wherein the difficulty of the software project is based on a software timing, whether pre-existing

documentation exists for the project, a scope of use of software being developed by the software

project, a complexity of the software, and a number of interfaces being used by the software.

However, Minkiewicz disclosed (col. 10, lines 10-19), "The estimating step...related to the

various parameters...information pertaining to various elements or items to be developed are

retrieved...These include...such as production rate, effort rating (difficulty of a software

project), size characteristics of the elements or items such as whether new, modified, reused

(whether pre-existing documentation exists for the project) as well as metric value, which could

be selected from a class including source line of code, metric, function point metrics

(complexity of the software) or predictive object point metric." Minkiewicz disclosed, "This

diseconomy of scale (more cost per function point, SLOC or POPS as the number

of function points, SLOC or POPs increases) is caused by the increased number

of interfaces required (a number of interfaces being used by the software) for larger software

projects. The effort rating is used to drive this exponent up since we can assume that as the

complexity of the code increases as the complexity of the interfaces increases as well." See

FIGs. 16 and 17 and related text at col. 9, line 60-col. 10, line 59. Col. 9, lines 62-63, "various

parameters used to specify software systems for forecasting purposes to one another." Col. 9,

line 66, "effort rating", col. 10, lines 1-3, "**software/hardware complexity** and **technology**

specifying timing and memory constraint parameters."

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the

invention to modify the Morgan / Reed combination, to provide more details related to

evaluating contributions of members based on difficulties of the software project, as disclosed by

Minkiewicz, because Morgan / Reed did disclose that consideration was given to employee

activity, and (Abstract, lines 7-11) human resource information is used along with information

directed to activities…to generate costs associated with activities performed by the organization.

Consideration to member contributions, taking into account the difficulty of the project provides

a more accurate product development quality plan. Morgan disclosed (col. 1, lines 39-42), "With

activity based costing information, managers are provided a true gauge of the business

operations, and can make better strategic business and management decisions."

5.   Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent 5,799,286 to Morgan et al., in view of US Patent 6,088,717 to Reed et al., in view of US

Patent 6,519,763 B1 to Kaufer et al., and further in view of US Patent 6,553,365 B1 to

Summerlin et al.

Per claim 11:

The Morgan / Reed combination failed to specifically disclose:

-the documentation process further comprises the steps of:

-classifying a document and assigning a document review workflow to the document according

to whether an originator of the document is a member of the organization;

-creating a document record in a document memory area of the at least one database.

However Jeffery disclosed (col. 15, lines 27-53), "a system according to the present invention may include a **workflow manager**...FIG. 32 illustrates an embodiment of a workflow manager web page. The workflow manager page shown in FIG. 32 includes a date that action was taken and a listing of topic. The workflow manager can also include links to all documents being handled through the workflow manager, **documents by author** (originator of the document is a member of the organization), **documents by category**, alternate name, and review status of documents. Clicking on one of the links transports a user to a list of all documents or all documents organized as indicated by the link. The topic and/or date shown in FIG. 32 may also provide links to pages of documents or actions by date, to the particular document referred to by the topic, or to a page that includes information regarding the status of the review, including **current, prior and future reviewers** (originator of the document is a member of the organization), originator of the review, category of the document, and/or any other information." Document storing is disclosed at col. 15, lines 55-67. See FIG. 34, #100 – Document Storage, Organization, and processing system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Morgan / Reed to include details related to classification of documents, as supplied by Jeffery, because Morgan was suggestive of document handling (Morgan: Col. 5, lines 28-31), "These activity names or codes are collected in a master activity dictionary (classifying a document), which functions as a glossary of activities for all sites..."), useful (Morgan: col. 1, lines 39-42) to make improved strategic business and management decisions.

Per claim 12:

-the document is a technical document associated with a software product.

(Morgan: Col. 5, lines 26-29, "For the intellectual property management organization, for

example, the activities may include soliciting invention disclosures, drafting patent applications

(technical document), drafting licensing agreements...")

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mary Steelman, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3704. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei

Zhen can be reached at (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned: 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mary Steelman

11/25/2005